

SCRIPTURE

THE QUARTERLY OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

VOL. III. No. 3

JULY 1948

EDITORIAL

In this number we publish articles of somewhat wider range than hitherto in an endeavour to cater for more tastes. Biblical literature for the beginner or the general reader is certainly the primary need and we shall keep this in mind in planning the Quarterly, but it seems best that this need should be chiefly met by means of pamphlets, booklets, and other publications. The selection of questions for answer in the Quarterly may also seem to some to be open to improvement. If more members would send in the questions they think need answers, the editor would then be able to make a better choice instead of being confined to the small number sent in at present.

It may be well to say here that the activity of the Association is being severely curtailed through lack of personnel. There are of course various activities going on regularly, such as the preparation of the Commentary, which is occupying a special committee of four and a large team of contributors fairly continually. Then there are the school text books which we have recently published, involving an immense amount of work, which has fallen chiefly on the shoulders of one man, Fr. Jones of Upholland. There is the Lending-library which continues to give service and to grow in size thanks to numerous gifts. There is a steady secretarial correspondence answering questions and difficulties of all kinds. Up till recently, too, there were lectures organized from time to time.

But if all these activities are to continue and grow and if others are to be added, it is essential to have a personnel with both time and ability to carry out the work. They must also be located where they can find the means to hand. We have had several offers of secretarial help such as typing. Some of these have been gratefully accepted. But at present we most need organizers, and, as it seems, organizers in London, who can see to our publications, arrange lectures, and so on.

We cannot continue indefinitely to be dependent on the few spare moments which busy men are able to allow from time to time to the work of the Association. Many attempts have been made to remedy this state of affairs but so far unsuccessfully. It looks as if we shall have to wait until more people are available. There is certainly an immense field of really fruitful activity waiting for our Association if only the labourers could be marshalled and set to work.

Rome. We have received the following items of news. During the summer the publication is expected of the third volume of *La Sacra Bibbia*, the new Italian translation of the Bible from the original languages, under the editorship of Rev. Fr. Vaccari, S.J. of the Biblical Institute. The second volume containing the books of Josue, Judges, Samuel and Kings was issued last year, and this third volume will conclude the historical books. Also recently published is the volume *Daniele* by Fr. Rinaldi CRS, similarly translated from the original texts and with a commentary. It is part of a series appearing under the editorship of Monsignor Salvatore Garofalo.

Fr. O'Rourke, S.J. whom some will remember as Rector of the Institute from 1924 to 1930 is at present Superior of the Biblical Institute in Jerusalem. He is remaining at his post in spite of many difficulties.

The new house for the professors of the Institute in Rome (work on which has made lectures at times almost inaudible) is already partly occupied, and the glad news has been announced that it will be ready by the time lectures begin next October. It is connected with the old building by a bridge across the Via del Vaccaro, but when it is completed the main entrance will be in the Via della Pilotta at number 25. The old building will be reserved for lecture halls, libraries and the museum.

Germany. We have mentioned in a previous number the work of the German Catholic Bible Society known as the *Kath. Bibelwerk Stuttgart*. It is good to see that in spite of innumerable difficulties they are able to continue, though not of course on the same scale as before the war. We have received several of their publications, some of which we review in this issue. They also publish small booklets of Bible readings for everyday, which are small enough to be slipped in a prayer-book. In appearance they are rather like those of the Bible Reading Fellowship, though not so elaborate in contents.

Lending Library. The generosity of our members is unfailing. We have to thank the donors of the following: Gordon, *The Liturgy and its Meaning*; Rolle, *Office Psalms*; Martindale, *The Prayers of the Missal*, Vols. I and II; McNabb, *Infallibility*; Barry, *Cardinal Newman*; Rousselot, *The Intellectualism of St. Thomas*; Walker, *Science and Revelation*, presented by Miss Poulter; Didon, *Jésus Christ*; Durand, *Evangile selon St. Jean*; Lepin, *Jésus Christ, sa vie et son oeuvre*, presented by R. A. Dean, Esq. *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (5 vols.); *The Koran* (Sale's trans.), presented by Dr. Van Acker; Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* (2 vols.); Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (3 vols.), presented by Rev. A. Clayton.

Back Numbers of "Scripture." Single copies may be obtained from the Secretary at 1s. 6d. each post free. Complete sets are still available (Jan. 1946 to date) at 1s. a copy, post free.

Books and Periodicals received

Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, ed. Pirot-Robert. Letouzey, Paris. May, *Ecce Agnus Dei* (John i; 29, 36). Cath. University of America, 1948.

Murphy, *A Study of Psalm 72* (71). Cath. University of America, 1948.

Saller, *Discoveries at St. John's, 'Ein Karim* 1941-2. Franciscan Press, Jerusalem, 1946.

Bagatti, *Il Santuario della Visitazione ad 'Ain Karim*. Franciscan Press, Jerusalem, 1948.

Black, *New Forms of the Old Faith*. Thomas Nelson and Sons, Edinburgh.

Thomson, *Parish and the Parish Church*. Thomas Nelson and Sons, Edinburgh.

Coppens, *La Connaissance du Bien et du Mal et le Pêché du Paradis*, Louvain, 1948.

Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Washington, U.S.A.

Verbum Domini. Biblical Institute, Rome, Italy.

Cultura Biblica. Segovia, Spain.

Theologisch-Praktisch Quartalschrift. Linz, Austria.

Pax. Prinknash Abbey, Gloucester.

LETTER OF THE PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION

In reply to questions asked about the date of the documents of the Pentateuch and the literary form of the first eleven chapters of Genesis, the Biblical Commission has addressed a letter to His Eminence Cardinal Suhard, Archbishop of Paris, containing the following points.

The Commission¹ first expresses a desire to promote Biblical studies assuring to the student the most complete liberty within the limits of the traditional teaching of the Church; and in this respect, a passage is quoted from *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, the Encyclical Letter of Pius XII on Biblical Studies. The replies of the Commission already published on the historical character of the Pentateuch, are next referred to—replies concerning the historical books in general (1905), the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch (1906) and the historical character of Genesis, chs. i-iii (1909). The Commission says that these replies in no way preclude further study of the questions in the light of the knowledge gained during the last forty years and hence does not consider it necessary, at least for the present, to issue any new decrees on the subject.

(1) As regards the composition of the Pentateuch—after reminding the reader of the reply of 1906, namely, that one may hold that Moses

¹ The full text of the Letter appears in the official *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1948, pp. 45-48.

used written documents and oral traditions in composing his work, and that there have been alterations and additions made after the time of Moses, the Commission goes on to say "Nobody nowadays doubts the existence of these sources or denies that there has been a progressive development or growth (*accroissement progressif*) of the Mosaic laws as a consequence of the social and religious conditions of later ages—a progress which may be seen also in the historical narratives." However, as there remains the greatest division of opinion as to the character and dates of the documents contained in the Pentateuch, and as some scholars totally reject the "documentary hypothesis" and attempt a solution along different lines, the Commission invites Catholic scholars to further unbiased study of these questions in the assurance that such examination will doubtless bring into greater relief the large part played by Moses and his profound influence as author and legislator.

(2) The question of the literary forms of Genesis chs. i-xi is, the Commission declares, a much more obscure and complex one. These literary forms are quite unlike those of classical or modern literature. Hence one cannot deny or affirm the historical character, *en bloc*, of these chapters, without forcing them into categories to which they do not belong. We may concede that they do not contain history in the classical or modern sense, but the state of our knowledge at present is not such as to allow us to give a positive solution to the problems they set. Further study is necessary.

To state simply that these narratives do not contain history as we know it, might easily give the impression that they do not contain history in any sense—whereas they do in fact relate in simple and figurative language adapted to uncultured minds the fundamental truths that underlie the "economy of salvation" and give a popular description of the origins of the human race and the Chosen People.

The letter, written in French, is signed by Fr. James M. Vosté, O.P., Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, and dated 16th January, 1948.

COMMENT

This document follows the same line as the Encyclical Letter *Divino Afflante Spiritu* in urging scholars to pursue their studies vigorously, secure in the confidence that truth can never contradict itself and taking as their guide the traditional teaching of the Church. Forty years ago when the exaggerations of "Higher criticism" appeared to be accepted as proved outside the Church and even by some Catholics, the policy was rather one of caution. Today, when non-Catholic scholars are so much more moderate in their views we may be thankful that Catholics were restrained from following the exaggerated opinions of yesterday.

As regards the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch—whereas in 1906 the Biblical Commission stated that it should be "substantially"

held, now it urges to further study so that "the large part and deep influence of Moses as author and lawgiver" may be brought out clearly. The Commission thus considers Moses as author of a "large part" of the Pentateuch and while admitting the view that there have been later additions and changes, nevertheless asserts that even such additions have been subject to the influence of Moses, so that they can be considered as applications of the ancient legislation to the new social and religious conditions.

The interesting point about the second part of the Letter is that the Commission does not restrict its remarks to the first three chapters of Genesis but includes the first eleven. The great advance made in secular knowledge made this necessary. Thus, for example, it is even held by some that the period of time that man has been on the earth must be measured in millions of years; and the span of human life does not appear to have been greater in the palaeolithic age than it is now. The culture which appears to be supposed in the early chapters of Genesis is the neolithic which was of course much more recent than the palaeolithic.

The principle to be invoked in order to preserve the inerrancy of Scripture was enunciated by Pope Leo XIII in the Encyclical Letter *Providentissimus Deus* and repeated in the Reply of the Biblical Commission on Genesis chs. i-iii namely, that "it was not the intention of the sacred writer to teach in scientific fashion the inner constitution of things and the complete order of their creation, but rather to convey to his own people a popular account in the language of the day and adapted to their understanding." The Biblical Commission applies this principle to the first eleven chapters of Genesis. Since these chapters contain history, at least in large part, it is necessary to find out exactly how this history is to be understood according to the mind of the author and the customs of his time. It is agreed that we have to look, not at classical or modern history but at ancient Oriental literature, and see what is contained there under the title of history. We find indeed that annals, legends, and popular oral traditions are all preserved and transmitted. At the same time we must recognize that even sources like these contain much valuable historical material. In a similar way we have to approach the study of the primitive history in Genesis, though always with full consideration of its inspired character. As the Pope says in *Divino Afflante Spiritu*: Literary forms and hence the mind of the author must not be decided *a priori* but should be reached by a careful investigation of the literatures of the Ancient East.

It must be admitted that here we are but at the beginning. We may compare the account of Paradise with various Sumerian traditions, or the genealogy of the Sethites with the Sumerian king-lists. Traces of floods in Babylonia have their relevance for the Biblical account of the Flood. Much work remains to be done in the study of comparative

philology and of the ways of thought of the Ancient East, which are so different from our own.

It is therefore with reason that the Commission declares that the time has not yet come for a final judgment to be passed on the early chapters of Genesis.

The above comments have been condensed from an article on this subject in *Verbum Domini* (1948, pp. 68-70).

THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST

IT will come to everyone's mind that the present Holy Father has lately issued an encyclical upon this subject (*Mystici Corporis Christi*: 29 June 1943), which I have before me in the Latin text, together with an excellent little summary in English published by the Grail (*This is Unity*: 9d). The encyclical itself showed the growing importance and implications of the subject, and the Grail pamphlet should do much to bring the main thoughts within the compass of every Catholic. The present article is part of an attempt to lay a solid foundation for such an understanding, by expounding the mind of St. Paul upon the subject, first with regard to the collective aspect, and later (if the Lord so will) with regard to its implications for the individual. But each article, so far as is possible, will be made complete in itself. By this method of approach a more profound view, it is to be hoped, will ultimately be gained of the whole doctrine; it seems to be the most promising start for that study and meditation upon it which the Holy Father undoubtedly desires to set on foot. It is also the best introduction to study and meditation upon St. Paul's own teaching, of which it is the complete synthesis. This was his own peculiar way of looking upon the whole significance of the Incarnation; and it was in this way that he taught it to his Christians.

This may appear at first sight somewhat surprising, that we should have to go back to St. Paul rather than to Christ Himself for a full understanding of the Saviour's work. It is indeed part of our Lord's marvellous humility, that He left it to His apostles, not only to do greater work than He had done (John xiv, 12): for one thing their mission to the gentiles was to be on the whole a marvellous success, whereas His own mission to the Jews had been on the whole a failure: but also to be taught by the Holy Spirit all truth (John xvi, 13), so that they should be able to go beyond what they had actually heard from Himself. This of course has led to the foolish contention that Paul is the real founder of Christianity, and other such notions, which cannot be discussed seriously here. It must be enough to point out that early in the ministry, according to all three Synoptic gospels, when it is objected to our Lord that only God can forgive sins, His only answer is to work

a miracle to prove that *He* can do so (Matt. ix, 1-8; Mark ii, 1-12; Luke v, 17-26). He also identifies Himself with His disciples (Luke x, 16) and with the least of His brethren (Matt. xxv, 40), though not under the precise figure of the Mystical Body. We must in fact realize that our Blessed Lord veiled His claims, partly because the Jews were unprepared for them, and partly because of their bad dispositions; the two reasons were mutually connected. Even in regard of His being the Messiah, and even in St. John's gospel (x, 24), we have the Jews asking impatiently for a plain statement; and they do not get it. After the return from the Babylonian exile (leave for which was granted by the Persian king Cyrus about 538 B.C.) monotheism triumphed, but with a certain exaggerated emphasis, so that, for example, the proper name of God (Jehovah or Yahweh) was never pronounced. To have come among the Jews claiming to *be* Jehovah would have been to give them a severe shock. And we can see from the New Testament and the Jewish documents themselves how much of their religion was mere formalism. The seed was scattered upon a stony soil. St. Paul, on the other hand, writing to those who were already Christians, lets himself go fearlessly, taking for granted all the instruction which they had already received, and opening out before them ever widening avenues of faith and hope and charity, but all centred upon Christ Himself and their union with Him.

The Apostle tells us in his epistle to the Ephesians (iii, 15) that it is from God the Father that all fatherhood in heaven and on earth is named. Being familiar with earthly fatherhood, we may unconsciously come to look upon the fatherhood of God as not a very convincing approach to it. But we must take to heart the Apostle's words and invert our ideas upon the subject; it is the function of human fatherhood to be some far-off presentation of the fatherhood of God, so that when we cry "Our Father" to Him, we are turning to the real source of fatherhood, from which we can come to know all that earthly fatherhood should mean. This divine fatherhood extends even to the dwellers in paradise, as the passage just quoted tells us, for God is "the father of spirits" (Heb. xii, 9), for to them too He communicates His holiness (Heb. xii, 10); but all this fatherhood in heaven and on earth has for its ultimate source the eternal generation of the Word.

In the same way human marriage, as we learn from the epistle to the Ephesians (especially Eph. v, 31-2), contains within itself a great mystery, inasmuch as it is its function to set forth the union and unity of Christ and the Church. "They two," as the Apostle says, quoting what is certainly the original text of Gen. ii, 24, "shall become one flesh," referring to that most intimate union of man and woman whereof the purpose is to produce a human progeny, even as the Church does for Christ, who loved the Church (Eph. v, 25) and still loves her. We speak sometimes of husband and wife having but one heart and soul, or one spirit,

and it is a blessed thing when we can so speak truly ; but this again is but a far-off image (so far as it is a merely natural image, not involving the spiritual reality) of Christ's bestowal of His Spirit, the Holy Spirit, upon the Church, whereby there is but one body and one Spirit, even as there is but one Lord, one faith, one baptism (Eph. iv, 4-5). This unity of the Spirit the Apostle urges his Christians—and through them, ourselves—to maintain (Eph. iv, 3). It has been an unfortunate expression, which seems to be disappearing before a better understanding of St. Paul, to speak of persons belonging to the soul of the Mystical Body, the Church, who do not belong to the body ; one might as well speak of our soul remaining in a severed limb. There are of course souls who in love of God and invincible ignorance may be said to belong to the Church *in voto*, in desire, and will be saved through God's uncovenanted mercies, but if not baptized they are outside the Church *in re*, in fact, and therefore are not inhabited by the Holy Ghost precisely under this aspect of the Soul of the Church, though (if in grace) indwelt under another and (as has been said) uncovenanted aspect.

To speak of the Mystical Body is to speak in a figure—a figure containing a tremendous truth and reality, greater than we can fully master—but still too much of a figure to offer of itself a secure basis for an elaborate and scientific system of theology. This fact comes home to one with somewhat uncongenial force when one reads, for example, of our Blessed Lady being the sacred neck or even the sacred heart of the Mystical Body. We see then that it is better to keep in close touch with the authentic sources of belief, and to make sure of the plain and simple doctrines in themselves, before we endeavour to interpret them in terms of the Mystical Body. It seems best, therefore, at this stage of the exposition to turn to Canon Law for a definition of Church membership. We may find it in canon 87 of the Code, which appears to give a plain answer to some hitherto rather doubtful questions. It runs as follows : " By baptism a man is constituted a person in the Church of Christ, with all the rights and duties of Christians, unless, so far as the rights are concerned, an obstacle stand in the way, impeding the bond of ecclesiastic communion, or a censure inflicted by the Church."

By baptism, therefore, anyone becomes a person inside the Church, " with all the rights and duties of Christians " ; and after that he can never become a person entirely outside the Church. All whose souls are sealed with the character of baptism are subject to the jurisdiction of the Church, and subject to it for the rest of their mortal lives. The Code envisages the possibility that they may lose some of their rights, for example through excommunication, but not that they may be put entirely outside the Church. This question was really settled in the rebaptism controversy, at the time of St. Cyprian, who so clearly erred on the point ; anyone who was utterly and entirely outside the Church would need to be baptized again. The bond of Church membership, as of

membership of any society, is to be found in jurisdiction ; and the Church never abandons her right of jurisdiction over the baptized, even if they be excommunicated. It is indeed because of this ever-present jurisdiction that (for example) she expressly excludes non-Catholics from some of her regulations about marriage. On the other hand even the severest excommunication does not usually carry with it (for example) an exemption of a priest from the recitation of the breviary, or of a layman from fasting and abstinence. Even the baptized who explicitly reject the Church's jurisdiction are not on that account exempt from it ; whether through their own fault or no, they are imperfect members of the Mystical Body, like deserters from an army or truants from school.

In the Supplement to the *Summa* of St. Thomas, put together after his death from his commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, in the sixth article of the twenty-second *quaestio*, the question is put, whether a person who has once been excommunicated can be excommunicated again. The first objection put forward is, that those who are excommunicated are outside the Church, and that the Church therefore has no power to pass judgement on them. But the answer given is that because the character of baptism is indelible, therefore the baptized always in some way remain of the Church, which therefore can always judge them. Of this canonical fact there is no doubt ; but it is not easy to express it becomingly in terms of a body ; we can call the excommunicated withered limbs, if we like, which can be restored to full life. But the figure of a body is not a very satisfactory foundation for a complete theology about the Church ; such a figure may help us to realize great and helpful truths, but accurate doctrine in detail is more easily secured by the use of more direct and scientific terms.

What St. Paul's use of the figure of the Mystical Body teaches us above all things is his strong sense of the unity of the Church, of the obligation to belong to that one living organism, each member of which ought to be in external organic unity with all the other members, the whole maintained in supernatural life by the Holy Ghost, communicated to the Body by Christ Himself. We are thus one with Christ and with each other, in a corporate unity maintained by the powers left by Him with His Church.

In the first place there is the power of rule or government. The Church is a supreme society, sovereign and independent in her own sphere, and in all that concerns her divine mission. Her visible head upon earth is the vicar of Christ, the bishop of Rome, whose jurisdiction is universal ; diocesan bishops receive through him their local jurisdiction, and from pope and bishops all other jurisdiction is derived. It expresses itself in legislative, executive and judicial powers, with a coercive power behind each, finding its supreme exercise in excommunication. The college of bishops is the successor of the college of apostles, so that it is not necessary to suppose that in the Pauline churches there were diocesan bishops,

but he supervised the colleges of priests by means of his letters and visits and use of what we may call apostolic delegates, such as Titus and Timothy. About his own authority to govern his churches he neither expressed nor felt any doubt; he even threatens to come to them with a rod! (I Cor. iv, 21). And he directs the Thessalonian church to excommunicate those who disobey him (II Thess. iii, 14).

Inwardly the Church is held together by faith, which is guaranteed by the infallible authority of popes and councils, and of the ordinary teaching of the Catholic hierarchy, with the pope assenting as its head. The apostles were not only infallible in their authoritative teaching, but were capable of receiving a new revelation, to be added to the deposit of faith. St. Paul's epistles are steeped in dogma, but he presupposes his Christians already instructed, and writes upon the articles of faith (as about the Real Presence and the Resurrection in I Corinthians) only as he finds some special occasion to do so.

The ultimate purpose of all is sanctification, which the Church accomplishes mainly through her sacrifice and sacraments. The New Testament is full of the need of baptism: the Real Presence is clear from the Last Supper (John vi and I Cor. xi), and the Mass from I Cor. x-xi and the prophecy of Malachy (i, 11), which the present writer edited early in the Westminster Version for the express purpose of drawing out this proof.

Thus we are consecrated and directed in the Mystical Body in a unity with Christ which the Fathers of the Church (whilst not actually using the expression "Mystical Body") call our deification. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporally; and in him ye attain your fulness" (Col. ii, 9-10). "And he hath given him for supreme head to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him who is wholly fulfilled in all" (Eph. i, 22-3).

CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.

THE BIBLE AND THE MASS

CATHOLICS in this country have generally been so anxious to show that the holy sacrifice of the Mass is an "action," and not a "mere form of words," that they have got into the way of paying little attention to the texts, which are sung or said on the occasion of its celebration. Some even make rather a point of doing so, thinking there is "something a bit protestant" about holy Scripture, and still more so about trying to "follow the service."

But this was not the attitude of Christians in ancient times, for they considered the Word of God as something almost sacramental on a par with the eucharistic elements themselves. Even today in eastern churches, more especially in Russian ones, nothing whatever may be placed on

the altar, the "holy table" but the *artophorion*, or tabernacle, containing the reserved Sacrament and the *myron*, or holy chrism, and the book of the gospels. In the Roman rite too we know what reverence is paid to the *Evangelarium*. It is a richly-bound volume, which is carried with lights and incense in solemn procession, and, after the appointed passage has been sung, the subdeacon carries it to be kissed by the celebrant, reverencing no one and nothing on the way, not even the blessed Sacrament exposed.

It must be remembered that the first part of the Mass, the didactic part, as it is called, or the "Mass of the catechumens," has really nothing to do with the eucharistic Sacrifice. It is a service, which is of the same nature as the office of matins, and is complete in itself and could be, and indeed has been often celebrated without being followed by the "Mass of the faithful." It consists, as did the office of the Synagogue, of three elements: prayer, praise, and reading for instruction and edification. All the texts recited are uttered for one or other of these objects. These latter ones, the readings, are entirely taken from holy Scripture. So too are the greater part of the hymns of praise and thanksgiving; they are in fact chiefly taken from the book of psalms.

The *Introut*, the *Offertory*, and the *Communion*, sung respectively during the entrance of the clergy, during the first approach of the faithful to make their offerings, and during the distribution of the holy communion, were originally whole psalms often interrupted after each verse, or after each two verses, by the repetition of an antiphon. Now they have been cut down to one verse or even to the antiphon alone, because the ceremonies that they accompanied have themselves been cut down or abolished, though in these last few years the liturgical movement has reintroduced them in quite a number of churches together with the restoration of the chants. The *Tract* too is sometimes an entire psalm, as on the first Sunday in Lent and on Palm Sunday, though on these days their lovely melodies generally come in for bad treatment from all but monastic choirs.

It is interesting to note that the tracts we have in the Missal for these chants (though not for the readings or lessons) are taken, not from the Vulgate version of the Bible, but from the Old Latin or *Itala*,¹ while the psalms are those of St. Jerome's first correction, called the "Roman," not of the "Gallican" version, which we use in the Divine Office.

We all know too what numerous discrepancies there are between the texts of the *Graduale Romanum* and those of the Missal. This is explained by the fact that Clement VIII in 1604 reformed a great number of scriptural passages in the Missal and many choir graduals were touched up to bring the texts into harmony with those of the Missal with a

¹ Compare for instance the text of the canticle of Habacuc as it is sung on Good Friday after the first lesson of the Mass of the Presanctified, and as it stands in the Bible or in the Breviary psalter.

consequent remanipulation of the melodies that accompanied them. But when, at the beginning of this century, Pius X caused the Church's official plainchant to be restored to its primitive purity, the monks of Solesmes, who undertook this work of restoration, in order to reintroduce the original melodies, had of course to take up again the original words as well.

At one time the readings were much more numerous than at present and probably much longer, especially for the "all-night service" which was held between Saturday and Sunday. Twelve seems to have been the classical number of lessons, and we still have twelve "prophecies" for the Easter vigil. Ember Saturdays, on which ordinations should take place, still have seven lessons; three readings were for a long period the usual custom, which the Missal still retains for Ember Wednesdays and for the Wednesdays *in mediana* (fourth week in Lent) and in Holy Week, also for Good Friday. It is also the rule in all Masses in the Ambrosian rite, the Mozarabic rite and certain eastern rites. Otherwise readings at Mass are reduced to two, an "epistle" which may not be an epistle at all, but may be taken from the Old Testament, from the Acts of the Apostles or from the Apocalypse of St. John, and the "Gospel," which is always taken from one of the four gospels. The reason why we have ordinarily two distinct chants after the epistle, is that the first of these was formerly sung after the Old Testament lesson, which preceded the epistle. Now that this lesson has fallen out, the two chants are executed one after the other.

It is possible that at one time, as was the case at mattins, the lessons at Mass were chosen each time by the celebrant and consequently were read directly out of the Bible or extracts of it, and were continued till the celebrant signed to the lector to stop. Very soon however certain portions were definitely assigned to the various feasts as well as to the stational Masses, when they often contained some allusion appropriate to the church or district where the station was being held. Some liturgists have thought they could discover some sort of *cursus* in the arrangement of the Sunday epistles¹ and even of the gospels, at least for the Sundays after Easter. But of these latter we certainly have not a continuous course of readings as has the Byzantine rite. It must be remembered that Mass was not celebrated every day as was the service of mattins, and so it did not lend itself to a systematic course of lessons like that of the night-office.

Of course there were local differences in the appointment of lessons to be read on given days. The arrangement of the Sarum missal, for instance, was not altogether identical with that of the Roman use, as can readily be seen if we examine the epistles and gospels as set forth in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. It is generally believed that the

¹ The Introit psalms for the Sundays after Pentecost are for the most part arranged in numerical order. So too are the alleluiaic verses, the offertories and the communions.

gospels for the Sundays after Pentecost have been dislocated each one a Sunday or two from the Mass to which they originally belonged.

The epistle and gospel are generally read just as they are found in the Bible, though very occasionally a few verses are omitted. On the other hand, some words have been added as for instance *Fratres* or *Carissim* at the beginning of epistles and *in Christo Jesu Domino nostro* at the end, *ait Dominus omnipotens* at the end of the prophecies, *In illo tempore dixit Jesus discipulis suis* or *turbis parabolam hanc* at the beginning of the gospel.

The manner of singing the various lessons at Mass is given among the *toni communes* in the Graduale Romanum; for the lessons or prophecies one manner only is given, for the epistle two, and for the gospel three with a more ornate melody for the gospels sung after the *Passions* in Holy Week. But various churches and religious orders have some ancient traditional melodies of their own.

The lessons are sung at a lectern in the middle of choir or better still in an ambo, or pulpit, and by a lector, or even by a layman acting as such, but not by a woman, not even a religious. The epistle is sung by the subdeacon, if one is present, otherwise by a lector, at the south end of the altar, or else in the ambo. The gospel is reserved to the deacon, or, if one be not ministering, then the celebrant himself will sing it. It should be sung in an ambo on the other side of the "presbytery" or in the same one as the epistle, only from a higher level, otherwise it is sung towards the north, the reason for this being that the deacon imitates the position of the celebrant, who reads the gospel from the altar turning as far as he can towards the people without taking the book off the altar. Although the deacon at his ordination is given authority to preach, yet it is generally the bishop himself, who expounds in a homily the gospel sung by the deacon at pontifical Mass.

In most churches, where the people do not understand Latin, at least the gospel is re-read in the vulgar tongue, and, though this is rather an unsatisfactory and illogical way of acting, it is a very ancient one, having been used in the synagogues of our Lord's time. In those days the people no longer understood Hebrew, the language in which the Scriptures were publicly read, and so, after this reading, a "Methurgeman" or interpreter translated them into Aramaic. Another attempt to remedy the regrettable non-participation of the faithful in the liturgy is made in certain countries by distributing leaflets to the people containing translations of the *proper* of the Mass. Without something of this kind the ordinary layman perceives no difference between the Mass for the 1st Sunday of Advent and that for Easter Day, except only the colour of the chasuble of the celebrant, and he remains completely cut off from all those marvellous riches of doctrine and poetry, which are contained in the sacred liturgy and which the Church would have him enjoy to the full.

RONALD PILKINGTON.

"CYRINUS THE GOVERNOR OF SYRIA"

ST. Luke and the Vulgate between them have transformed the original name of Quirinius into Cyrenus. The most interesting thing about Quirinius of course is his connexion with the census which was taken in Palestine at the time of our Lord's birth. This has been (and still is) the subject of much controversy (Luke, ii, 2). It seems worth while, without entering into this discussion, to give a sketch of the acknowledged facts of Quirinius's life—he was a very important man in his time, especially in the eastern provinces, and the census is not his only point of contact with New Testament history.

Publius Sulpicius Quirinius was probably born some time between 60 and 50 B.C. His family belonged to the little town of Lanuvium (now Lavinia) situated at the foot of the Alban Hills close to the Appian Way and about twenty-five miles from Rome. His family was not noble, but we have no evidence that they were poor. They were not connected by blood with the celebrated family of the Sulpicii, but one of these may have adopted Quirinius. We hear of some sort of relationship to another noble family, the Scribonii. It seems therefore risky to say that Quirinius was of humble origin. The eminent position to which he rose was however largely due to his ability as an officer and his hard work. Tacitus calls him a "tireless soldier." Where and under what commander he served his apprenticeship in arms we do not know. Some time between 20 and 15 B.C. he probably held the office of praetor and it was no doubt soon after this date that he performed his first important military exploit, a campaign against two nomad tribes which dwelt in the Western Desert between Egypt and the Gulf of Sidra. He was very likely governor of Crete-Cyrene when he carried out this operation, but he may have done so at an earlier date as commander of one of the legions stationed in Egypt. No doubt it was some time in this period of his life that he married Appia Claudia Pulchra, a lady belonging to one of the most ancient and illustrious families of Rome. In 12 B.C. he became consul, one of the two eponymous or titular consuls of the year, a great honour for a man who was not of noble blood. His colleague in the consulship was his wife's brother, Messalla Appianus, who had married the emperor's niece and seemed to have a brilliant career before him. But Messalla died suddenly a few days after he and Quirinius had entered on their consulship, and his place was filled by Valgius Rufus the poet. Later in the same spring Marcus Agrippa, the foremost general of Augustus's reign, died in the prime of life.

After his consulship Quirinius was assigned a difficult military task in the East which had for years been waiting for some general, the subjugation of the wild Pisidian and Isaurian highlanders. In south-central Asia Minor the region of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium etc., the country of St. Paul's first missionary journey (Acts xiii, 14—xiv, 23)

had for many years been settling down into a peaceful and orderly land. South of it, on the nearest coast, the Pamphylian country, after a period of disorder was entering on a new prosperity. But between the two regions stretched a mountain-range rising to 8,000 feet, inhabited by lawless tribes whose raids made life and property insecure in the lowland towns. Persian and Greek kings had long counted them among their subjects, but no power had ever been able to impose order on them. Some twenty years earlier Amyntas the last king of Galatia had tried hard to do so, and had perished in the attempt. The most ferocious clan in these hills, the leaders in robbery and resistance alike, had their headquarters at a town or village called Homanada, situated where Pisidia merges into Isauria. Its site has not yet been identified, but no doubt it will be known some day, for after Quirinius's time it had a long peaceful history, and was eventually the seat of a Christian bishop. There must be substantial remains left. No doubt the Homanadenses, as they were called, headed a league or exercised an overlordship over most of the 200 miles of the mountain-range. They inhabited a steep-sided valley: Strabo's description of it makes one think of the Doone valley: "Their country lies amidst the heights of the Taurus, between precipices which are in most places impassable. Its centre is a deep-lying fertile plain, running up into several side-valleys. They used to cultivate this, dwelling on the heights above it, or in caves. But they spent most of their time in arms." If we can rely on this account, the most probable place is the marshy valley in which Lake Trogitis (now Sughla) lies, about fifty miles south-west of Iconium (Konya).

King Amyntas spent years in strenuous warfare among the mountains. In the western area he took several Pisidian strongholds reputed impregnable. On the eastern side he took Derbe, lying under the Isaurian mountains, and slew its despot, Antipater, a bad man who was in league with the brigands. Between these two points he overran and occupied the country of the Homanadenses, killed their chief, and drove them to their secret hiding-places in the rocks. To secure the territory he began to construct a great fortress, some five miles in circumference, at the southern entrance to their valley, on the towering hill-top of Isaura. Great portions of his splendidly built walls and towers remain to this day. But his course was cut short. The wife of the dead chieftain of Homanada apparently took command of the remnant of the tribe. She decoyed the king into an ambush, took him prisoner and avenged her husband by putting him to death. This was in 25 B.C. The Roman government made his large kingdom into the province of Galatia. The annexation was a kind of pledge that they would finish Amyntas's work, but fourteen years had passed and the highlanders seem to have largely recovered from the blows they had suffered, and to have ventured to renew their raids.

Quirinius was now sent out to finish the task, and he did so between

the years 11 and 7 B.C. He must have been provided with strong forces. Besides meeting with guerilla tactics he had to reduce a large number (perhaps forty-four in all) of mountain strongholds scattered probably over a long stretch of South Galatia. Some were of such natural strength that they had to be starved into surrender. The struggle must have been as tragic and ruthless as such "pacifications" usually are. At the end Quirinius had 4,000 prisoners, all that remained of the active male population of a wide area. Instead of selling them into slavery or sending them to be butchered in the amphitheatre, as was so often done by Roman generals, Quirinius acted more humanely and only deported them to the lowlands where they were taught or compelled to re-start life as orderly citizens. The future peace of the mountains was secured by the construction of fortresses and roads. Five military colonies were founded on their northern slopes. They stretched for 150 miles, from Olbasa in the west to Lystra in the east. Roads were planned, connecting these together and with the cities to the north, and other roads not long afterwards crossing the mountains to the coast. The work was probably planned by Quirinius and was already in progress in 6 B.C. but Quirinius had no doubt already gone. We hear little after this of disorders in these mountains. Fifty years later Paul and Barnabas were able to cross and recross them apparently without great danger. (Acts xiii, 14 and xiv, 23). They visited at least one of the military colonies, Lystra. As a mark of its gratitude Pisidian Antioch elected Quirinius to its chief magistracy, which he held by deputy.

What was Quirinius's official position during these years in the East? It has been usually thought that he was a governor of Syria, and that during the same period he took a census in Syria and Palestine, the census which coincided with our Lord's birth. This is certainly in accordance with the most natural sense of St. Luke's words (ii, 2) and with that of the usual translation. There are indeed difficulties both about date and also about administration, and the Isaurian country was separated from Syria by a broad strip of the Cappadocian kingdom which then reached to the Mediterranean. But all other solutions raise fresh difficulties which are at least equally grave. We cannot enter into this complex question here. If we assume that Quirinius was governor of Syria, the date of Christ's birth can hardly be later than 7 B.C. even if we suppose that the census was finished by his successor and that Palestine was left to the last. It is strange to think that the same man (under Providence) caused our Lord to be born in a stable and smoothed a way for St. Paul over the Pisidian mountains.

On his return to Rome Quirinius was awarded the right to wear on certain occasions the gorgeous robes of a triumphator. The triumphal procession itself was now restricted to members of the emperor's family. He may have spent the next five or six years at Rome. Some time before going out to Syria he had probably become closely acquainted with

the emperor's stepson Tiberius Claudius Nero, who became the next emperor, though nobody at this time expected that he would. Quirinius and Tiberius no doubt felt they had a good deal in common. Both were soldiers of the stern laborious old Roman type. In 6 B.C. Tiberius abandoned his public career in disgust, against Augustus's wishes, and retired to the island of Rhodes, where he spent seven years, half-forgotten and almost in disgrace. Many Roman officials in the East thought it prudent to ignore him, but Quirinius, either on his way back to Rome after the conquest of the Homanadenses or on his next journey to the East, visited Tiberius at Rhodes, at the risk of giving some offence to the emperor. The visit proves the independence of his character. Tiberius never forgot the act of kindness, for he made special mention of it many years later after Quirinius's death, and upon his accession he showed his gratitude by the special consideration and influence enjoyed by Quirinius.

In 1 B.C. Augustus sent his grandson Gaius Caesar aged nineteen, whom he intended to be his successor, to the East in order to prove his ability by settling the quarrel between Rome and the Parthian Empire, a quarrel chiefly about the choice of a king for Armenia. The young prince was accompanied by Marcus Lollius as his chief adviser and by a staff of distinguished men. If Quirinius was not at this time in the East, he must have travelled there with Gaius. The party visited Greece, then Egypt. Gaius seems to have been curious to see Herod's great new temple at Jerusalem, but in deference to Augustus he refrained from paying such an honour to an "oriental superstition," and went to Syria by sea. The middle course of the Euphrates formed the boundary between the two empires, and there on some day in A.D. 1 the Parthian king met Gaius and agreed to the Roman demands. Quirinius was no doubt present at the meeting. A young Roman officer who was also there, Velleius Paterculus, wrote a description of the scene nearly thirty years later. Roman and Parthian armies were drawn up facing one another on opposite banks of the river, while the two princes, each with a strictly equal retinue, met on an island in mid-stream to carry on their negotiations. During the festivities which followed the treaty the Parthian king disclosed and apparently proved to Gaius that Lollius had accepted bribes from the Parthians. This brought him under suspicion of treason. A few days later Lollius died, either crushed by the disgrace or, as some thought, by suicide. It was Quirinius who succeeded to the position of chief adviser to Gaius.

A party in Armenia refused to accept the king chosen by Rome, and it became necessary for Gaius and Quirinius to take a Roman army into that remote mountainous country. Gaius soon received a wound (in A.D. 2) which put him out of action and left Quirinius in sole command. Quirinius pushed on the war with his usual energy and had crushed all resistance before the end of the next year. He seems to have returned

to Rome immediately. Gaius never recovered and died in A.D. 4 on his way back. Augustus was left in his old age without any descendant capable of succeeding him, and decided to adopt his stepson Tiberius Nero, who had already returned to Italy, and to mark him as his successor. Tiberius Cæsar (as he now became) remained a firm friend to Quirinius as long as the latter lived. It was no doubt due to his influence that a "brilliant" marriage was now arranged for Quirinius, who had lost his previous wife by death or divorce. His new bride was a young woman of the highest nobility, Aemilia Lepida. She had been engaged to Augustus's younger grandson Lucius, who had died before Gaius. The marriage was an unhappy one. Quirinius was not much less than sixty, apparently a grave reserved man. His wife was scarcely twenty. If we may believe Tacitus, she was, or became, a bad character. Quirinius at any rate convinced himself that she had not only been unfaithful to him but had tried to poison him. A year or two after the marriage he divorced her and refused to acknowledge the child she had borne.

His mind was soon turned to more congenial objects, for the government found new work for him in the East. He was sent again to Syria as governor, with some important special tasks to perform. The complaints of the Jews had now induced Augustus to depose Archelaus who had received Judæa and Samaria as his share of Herod the Great's kingdom. Quirinius was to organize his territory as a small Roman province. In Armenia the royal family whom Quirinius had so lately established had perished, and another king was called for. Augustus had chosen a young Jewish prince brought up in Rome. He was descended on one side from Herod the Great and on the other from an Armenian princess. He is known to us under the name of Tigranes, a name perhaps assumed for this occasion, as it had been borne by past kings of Armenia. It was Quirinius's duty to help him with military force if it should prove necessary. He must also have been asked to raise troops in Syria to reinforce Tiberius's army which was fighting desperately with the revolted Pannonians (in Yugoslavia). Quirinius arrived in Syria in A.D. 5 or 6 and remained there for a period of two to four years. Armenia proved an easy task: the name of Quirinius was probably enough to overawe any would-be opponents. Tigranes was established on the throne without the use of any Roman force. The settlement of Judæa proved much more difficult. There now appeared an extreme Pharisaic party who asserted that for the Jews to submit to a pagan government would be not only a calamity but a sin. These were the men who afterwards became known as Zealots. They were led by one "Judas of Galilee" or "Judas of Gamala" whether fanatic or adventurer it is now hard to guess. His agitation was favoured by circumstances. In Syria the periodical census, taken usually every twelve or fourteen years, was now due, and Quirinius naturally decided that it should embrace the new province of Judæa as well as the various small principalities attached to the two

provinces. The main purpose of the census was to provide information for the assessment of the direct taxes paid to Rome, and it thus acquired a new meaning which the previous census (at our Lord's birth) did not possess: it was a visible sign of pagan rule, and was bitterly opposed by Judas's party. Moreover Quirinius was probably levying soldiers for Pannonia in all the pagan districts under his control, and although it had long been the custom not to enforce the Roman conscription on Jews, it may well have been feared and rumoured that in the present emergency the exemption would not be continued. It is not clear how much of the resistance was passive and how much was actual rebellion. It seems not unlikely that the strongest opposition was in the tetrarchies of Herod Antipas and Philip rather than in the new province, where Quirinius received valuable support from Joazar, the High Priest, who belonged apparently to the party which had asked for direct Roman rule. Quirinius was able after some delay to overcome the resistance and to complete his census. Before he left, a disagreement arose between him and Joazar. Quirinius removed the High Priest and appointed Annas in his place, the first time but by no means the last that a Roman governor made and unmade high priests. It was not in Palestine only that Quirinius had to put down disorders. An inscription found at Beirut shows that one of his officers Aemilius Secundus had both taken the census of the city of Apamea in northern Syria "at Quirinius's orders" and had also captured a stronghold of the lawless Itureans in the Lebanon. The inscription may however belong to his earlier governorship.

After his return from Syria till his death in A.D. 21 Quirinius probably remained in Italy. King Tigranes was soon driven out by the Armenians who disliked his Roman ways, and was perhaps not sorry to follow Quirinius to Italy and spend the rest of his days there. In A.D. 14 Tiberius became emperor, and his steady friendship made Quirinius one of the most influential men in the empire during his last years. He was also a man of great wealth. It was generally thought that he used neither his riches nor his influence to the best advantage. He was illiberal, if not miserly: we hear of no great building or public work made possible by Quirinius's generosity, nor of any act of clemency or kindness performed by Tiberius at his request. In A.D. 16 his relative Scribonius Libo Drusus, a silly and extravagant young aristocrat, who had dabbled in treason, was betrayed by pretended friends who had led him on. He was brought to trial, and when he saw that he would be condemned, he asked Quirinius to convey his last humble entreaties to the emperor. Libo received a cold non-committal answer from Tiberius and the same night he died by his own hand. Tiberius then said that he would have spared his life even if he had been condemned. We have the impression that Quirinius's intercession had been half-hearted. Very likely he thoroughly despised Libo.

At the very end of his days his hostility to his former wife Aemilia

Lepida breaks out afresh. After her divorce she had married the prominent orator Mamerus Scaurus, but after bearing him a daughter was now divorced from him also. She continued to treat her eldest child, probably a son, as Quirinius's, and it was this apparently that aroused Quirinius's rage. He seems to have suspected some design on his wealth. He had no children by any other marriage, and perhaps he feared that the large legacy which custom would compel him to bequeath to the emperor would eventually find its way into Lepida's hands—such legacies were often given away to relatives by both Augustus and Tiberius. At any rate he decided to destroy Lepida if he could. In A.D. 20 he not only accused her of false statements about the child, but he revived the charges of adultery and poisoning which he had made fifteen or sixteen years before but had not then brought into court. Some treasonable practices (which could be punished with death) were also urged against her. Not much can be said perhaps for Lepida. The best thing in her favour is the fact that her brother Manius Lepidus, a man of honourable and independent character, appeared as her defending counsel. As both Lepidus and Quirinius were friends of Tiberius, his sympathies were visibly divided. The revival of charges dropped so long ago naturally brought great odium on Quirinius, and Lepida did her best to aggravate this feeling. The trial was interrupted by some public holiday in the course of which there was a performance in Pompey's theatre, the largest in Rome. Adjoining the theatre was a great portico and other buildings including the hall in which some sixty years earlier Julius Cæsar had been murdered and had fallen by the pedestal of a statue of Pompey. This chamber had long been walled up as an accursed spot, but the statue had been moved to a conspicuous place in the auditorium of the theatre. Lepida was a great-granddaughter of Pompey. She came to the theatre clothed no doubt in mourning (as was the custom for persons on trial) and therefore very prominent in the festive crowd. As she passed the statue, she took the opportunity of bursting into tears in the sight of the assembled thousands, and called upon Pompey to witness the cruelty and injustice inflicted on her. The spectators were easily moved to weep with her, indignant that a noble lady who nearly became an empress should be sacrificed to please an upstart. The air was filled with abuse and curses directed against Quirinius. Whether he was present or not, he must have been deeply hurt at this manifest proof of his unpopularity. But Lepida cannot have improved her case by this scene. The charge of treason seems to have been dropped, but her slaves under torture gave incriminating testimony about the attempted murder and apparently about the adultery. Such evidence, of very doubtful value in itself, may or may not have been corroborated by other discoveries. In any case she was condemned and sentenced to banishment, but at Scaurus's plea she was spared from the confiscation which usually accompanied this sentence.

In the following year (A.D. 21) Quirinius died. The emperor himself asked for the honour of a state funeral for him and spoke warmly of his services and their friendship. Had he died ten years sooner, he would no doubt have been valued as he deserved for the great qualities which he certainly possessed, his energy, humanity and moral courage. As it was, men were more prone to remember his "mean and tyrannical old age." Velleius, who probably knew him well, and who moreover was anxious to pay compliments to Tiberius's friends, had several opportunities of mentioning Quirinius but never did so. His silence is a most eloquent testimony to the bad name that Quirinius left behind him.

W. REES.

NEW LIGHT ON OLD TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

RECENT WORK IN FRANCE.

THE Encyclical Letter, *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, has indicated the direction that Biblical exegesis should take, especially for the Old Testament: "to remain sensitively faithful to the belief of our fathers in the Written Word of God, but at the same time to apply to it the most tried methods of textual and form criticism in order to understand and utilize it better."¹

The faithful should not be disquieted at the results of such methods when applied to the early chapters of Genesis. In a deeply interesting article, His Eminence Cardinal Liénart² has shown that there can be no contradiction between the Biblical cosmogony and the conclusions of science: science and faith, established on two different planes converge towards the one Truth: the revealed truth of Genesis and the results of human research harmonize, provided that we modify our interpretation and broaden its scope according to the established facts.

Besides, revelation and faith alone can enlighten us on the origin of life, of thought, of evil, of evolution and the direction it will take, of man constituted as such by the direct creation of the spiritual soul. Moreover, God intended to accomplish a work, even more marvellous in the order of grace.

This last fact enables us to grasp the meaning of the Old Testament. A. Gelin³ describes the leading ideas to be found there, as they develop, are purified and are deepened in the course of centuries and through the pressure of events, finally reaching their goal in Christ: the discovery

¹ A Robert, *Interprétation contemporaine de l'A.T.* in *Dict. de la Bible, Supplément*; (abbrev. D.B.S.). 1947 col. 636.

² *Le Chrétien devant les progrès de la science*, in *Etudes*, Dec. 1947, pp. 289-300.

³ *Les idées maîtresses de l'A.T.* (coll. *Lectio Divina*, no. 2, Paris, 1948, pp. 88.

of God as unique, spiritual, transcendent, near to His own, the expectation of the Messiah and Messianic rewards gradually becoming a hope more and more spiritualized; the slow birth of individualism, which however, never goes beyond the racial limits.

Yet rewards and punishments envisaged at first as collective and temporal, appear finally as individual and belonging to the next life: at the same time the sense of sin grows more keen and the value of intercession comes to be appreciated. More than once, we may note finally, the sacred text records authentic mystical experiences of these less favoured ones of the Old Testament who sought intimacy with their God.

Two texts in particular, show early stages in the development of the idea of God (Gen. 11, 1-9, Ps. xxiv, 7-10). According to J. Chaine¹ the first is an account which has some dependence on Canaanite tradition and is still very anthropomorphic: but Yahweh appears there as the only God and all-powerful and He alone lives for ever. No man can infringe his prerogatives without incurring punishment. Later on, God is considered as Lord of Hosts, leader of the armies of Israel, whose presence is bound to the Ark: this ancient idea is clear in Ps. xxiv, 7-10. Moreover, Podechard² sees in this passage a poem composed for the triumphal entry of the Ark into Jerusalem at the time of David.

The gradual "de-localization" and spiritualization of the idea of God as well as the development of the Messianic expectation and individualism may be followed in the writings of the prophets. A. Feuillet has written a well-considered and informed yet bold article on *Isaïas*³ in which he deals with the grave problems set by this book. He brings out the great diversity of literary forms and at the same time the richness and variety of the doctrine: for example, the universalism centred on Mount Sion (ch. i-xxxix), then detached from the Temple and the House of David (xl-xlv) and finally again centralized but even more nationalist (lxi-lxvi).

No less was the prestige of *Jeremias*: rightly does A. Gelin refuse to separate his life from his teaching⁴: the prophet deepens the sense of sin; he lives in intimate communion with God. So it is that he was able to announce the New Covenant which is both interior and individual. Hence the great influence which he was able to exert after his death above all on *Ezechiel* and perhaps also on some passages of the prophet *Isaïas*.

On the book of *Jonas*, this influence was direct: A. Feuillet⁵ shows that in it we have the developed doctrine of divine pardon, in strict relation to change of heart on the part of man: at the same time we find

¹ *La Tour de Babel*, in *Mélanges Podechard*, Lyons, 1945, pp. 63-9.

² *Psaume xxiv*, 7-10, in *Mémorial Lagrange*, Paris, 1940, pp. 143-6.

³ *Le Livre d'Isaïe*, in D.B.S., 1947, col. 647-729.

⁴ *Le Livre de Jérémie*, in D.B.S., 1948, col. 857-89.

⁵ *Sources et sens du livre de Jonas*, in *Revue Biblique* 1947, pp. 161-86 and pp. 340-61.

in the book a broad universalism which is much in the same line of thought as the books of Ruth and Job. We should therefore date the work in the middle of the fifth century B.C.—a period when the conflict between universalism and particularism was at its height.

In speaking of the mystical experiences of the Old Testament one's thoughts turn instinctively towards the Canticle of Canticles—but how varied are the opinions and how strange are many of them on this subject ! A. Robert¹ reminds us that a Catholic may not abandon the inspired spiritual sense of this book which has been included in the Canon of Scripture and recognized as profoundly mystical by the whole of Catholic Tradition. To understand it, we must take into account the methods of composition which were in vogue after the exile—this was the era of the scribe, of profound study of the Scriptures and of attempts to work out in ancient terminology the new problems of social and religious life. Hence as a result, there are many subtleties which are quite conformable to the Oriental mind. We have then to find the literary background to the work. In applying this method, the author recognizes certain Deuteronomic texts as being at the base of the description of the Bridegroom (v, 11–15), namely, Deut. xii, 5 etc. And this allows us to identify him with the Temple. In the same way, the description of the Bride based on Osee ii, 5 ; xiv, 6–8, identifies her with the Holy land—a moving aspect of the general theme of the book which is the union of Yahweh with Israel.

R. TAMISIER.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Is it possible to take the Hebrew word translated as "serpent" in Genesis ch. iii, as coming from a root meaning "to shine," and translate it as "shining one" ? In this case Satan would have appeared as an "angel of light" (cf. II Cor. xi, 14) and the difficulty about talking snakes would disappear.

The Hebrew word in question is *nahash*. There is a root *nahash* which may possibly mean to shine, but which Brown, Driver, Briggs give as of unknown meaning. The word in dispute here however is always taken as coming from the root *nahash* to hiss, and meaning serpent. The impossibility of the suggested translation "shining one" may be further seen by simply substituting it in the text, and seeing what havoc is wrought in the sense, e.g. verses 1 and 14.

The symbolism of the serpent is full of meaning and it is to be found in many ancient religions of the East, sometimes in close association with gods, sometimes as itself a god. In Egyptian legends "it usually appears as a rebel, in eternal conflict with gods and men in the nether

¹ *La description de l'Epoux et de l'Epouse dans le Cantique*, in *Melanges Podechard*, Lyons, 1945, pp. 211–23.

world," Yahuda, *The Accuracy of the Bible*, p. 183. In one instance the serpent is depicted with human arms and legs, standing upright before a deity and putting a round-shaped cake in its mouth. It was the role of the serpent to supply the gods with food in the nether world. In Palestine itself before the Israelite conquest, we learn from archæology, the serpent was the emblem or attribute of gods or goddesses of fertility and hence of sexual life, cf. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archæology*, and Coppens, *La Connaissance du Bien et du Mal et le Pêché du Paradis*, 1948, Louvain. There would therefore be nothing surprising in the use of the serpent in the Genesis narrative to indicate a superior being, while attaching a somewhat different meaning to it, namely making it stand for Satan himself.

These early chapters of Genesis are admitted to contain a certain amount of symbolism, as is stated in the recent Letter of the Biblical Commission elsewhere in this issue; and since the purpose of this symbolism was to make these profound truths intelligible to the common folk, the actual symbols used would naturally be those with which they were familiar, always provided that they did not in any way militate against the exalted character of the inspired text. Now the Israelites had spent centuries in Egypt and had contact with the peoples of Canaan even before the actual conquest. Hence they must have been acquainted with the symbolism of the serpent.

Whether the serpent of Genesis ch. iii, is to be taken as a symbol or whether Satan actually appeared to Eve in the form of a serpent cannot be decided with any degree of assurance. It has been said that the reply of the Biblical Commission on the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis (1909) excludes the former interpretation. But this does not appear to be the case. The Commission, in enumerating the nine points which must be taken as historical, mentions the transgression of the divine command at the instigation of the Devil, under the appearance of a serpent (*diabolo sub serpentis specie suasore*). This wording certainly seems to suggest that the appearance under the form of a serpent is to be taken as historical fact; but another explanation is possible. Since the Devil is not mentioned by name in the narrative, the Commission felt it necessary to specify exactly whom they referred to and this might account for the mention of the serpent in their list of historical points, without necessarily implying that it is to be taken as historical fact, cf. *Enchiridion Biblicum*, no. 334; Ceuppens, *Genèse i-iii*, p. 153.

R. C. FULLER.

Why should the mention of the bodies of the saints rising from the dead after Christ's resurrection (Matt. xxvii, 52-3) be inserted here just after Christ's death? What exactly happened and what is its significance?

The reason for its mention here is probably because of its connection with the earthquake which caused the opening of the tombs. It is hardly

conceivable that they would have risen from the dead on Good Friday and come forth from the tomb only on Easter Sunday. The latter event is explicitly stated not to have occurred until after Christ's resurrection. But the full significance would be lost had they risen earlier. "Christ," as St. Paul tells us "is risen from the dead, the *first fruits* of them that sleep," I Cor. xv, 20.

We learn from I Peter, iii, 18 that Christ, after His death, went down to Limbo, where the souls of the just who died before Him were detained, and brought them the good news of the redemption. On the morning of the Resurrection, He led them into glory, though not of course with their glorified bodies, for they had to wait for the General Resurrection when Christ comes again, before they could possess those. This is the general teaching of the Fathers.

What then is the event Matthew relates? There can hardly be serious doubt that the Evangelist is speaking of real bodies. He gives no indication at all that he is only speaking of phantoms. A large number of Fathers and commentators hold that a certain number of the just, who were buried near Jerusalem, were given glorified bodies on the morning of the resurrection of Christ, that they then appeared to many during the days that followed and that they went up into heaven with their glorified bodies at Christ's Ascension. Thus Epiphanius, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Maldonatus, a Lapide. They would thus be a striking exception to the general rule with regard to the Resurrection of the Body at the Last Day.

Others, however, following St. Augustine (and these seem to be in a majority today) prefer to say that they did not receive glorified bodies, but natural bodies which they had on earth during their life, that they appeared to various people in Jerusalem and that after a short time, their bodies returned to the grave to await the General Resurrection, while their souls went up into heaven, now open since the resurrection of Christ. St. Augustine concludes from Hebrews xi, 39-40 that they would not have received their glorified bodies before the rest of mankind. Lagrange, Belser and Poelzl prefer this view.

The purpose of the appearance of these bodies was no doubt to show visibly that Christ has raised us from the death of sin and that at the Last Day we shall possess glorified bodies, as Christ did on Easter Sunday. In other words it was to stress the significance of Christ's death and resurrection.

Explanations of the passage will be found in Poelzl, *The Passion and Glory of Jesus Christ* and in Belser, *The History of the Passion*.

R. C. FULLER.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Christ of Catholicism. By Dom Aelred Graham. (Longmans, 1947). pp. 381. 21s.

The title of this book is not meant to suggest that there is any distinction between the Christ of Catholicism and the Christ of history, but rather to show how the Catholic answer to the question "What think ye of Christ?" remains unchanged and unembarrassed in the face of modern criticism. It is meant to show that our task is helped rather than burdened by the resources of modern scholarship. Father Aelred gained the confidence of English Catholics with his well-known theological synthesis on the *Love of God*. In the present work he fully maintains the standard he has set himself.

It is a book that will help both Catholics and non-Catholics to realize that our Catholic faith gives us what surely must be the only possible coherent picture of the greatest figure of history. Father Aelred does not establish this by controversy. He is content to let the Catholic interpretation commend itself by its own evident truth, rather than by the falsity of rival portraits.

In modern times there have been a number of non-Catholic "biographies" of Christ, often from the popular introspective or psychoanalytic standpoint, based on the assumption that he was in the end a man like other men. Such lives have invariably failed. Catholics know they must fail since they start from a false presupposition. Christ was not a mere man, and to paint Him as such must fail to convince.

On the other hand, though Christ was no ordinary man, he was in a sense more perfectly man than any other. Christians, in their anxiety to save His godhead, have often spoken of Him so abstractedly as to obscure His manhood.

Father Aelred has, I believe, for years had the ambition to fulfil the need of a picture of Christ that, without sacrificing anything of his eternal oneness with the Father would yet portray Him as a man with a character and place in history; a picture that would not only proclaim but also show Him as fully God and fully man; fully the Christ of the Synoptics and St. John, and fully the Christ of St. Paul and the Fathers, fully the Christ of theology and devotion. It would be misleading to say that nothing of this had been done before. But at least it has not been done in this way. Other works have either been very brief and popular, or they have been the work of specialists, dealing perhaps with Christ's life and teaching, perhaps with the exegesis of Scripture, or perhaps with the theology of the Incarnation and the Redemption. Father Aelred has availed himself of all these specialist works, and in the more important matters gives us the result of their research. Even so, his work would have seemed too alarmingly temerarious, were he not speaking out of the fullness of Catholic tradition, which had known Christ for nineteen

centuries, and known Him as truly God and truly man. It is Father Aelred's good fortune to have the gift of expressing this tradition in a clear and scholarly manner, showing us the underlying unity joining the many pictures of Christ, whether in theology, scripture, tradition or devotion.

Naturally the treatment of isolated questions is brief. But it is valuable for the educated Catholic to possess a sound statement of our position with copious references to the Scriptures and St. Thomas and a useful select bibliography of Catholic and non-Catholic studies in Christology.

The plan of the book is first to treat the story of Christ's life, showing how it is enlightened for us by our Catholic faith as to Christ's Person and work; and afterwards to deal with the theology of Christ in relation to His life. It ends with a consideration of the continuance of the Incarnation in the Mystical Body through the ages.

Father Aelred has no ambition but to present to us the Christ of Catholicism. Where there is variety of theological opinion, he follows the more traditional view. More often than not he stops short at the point where controversy begins, thus leaving controverted questions open. I did however notice one instance, at the top of p. 207 where he seems to dismiss in a few lines a widely held view of the nature of personality, attributed by many to St. Thomas and Capreolus, and recently defended by Father Carlo Giacon, S.J. of Milan. I would suggest for further editions that it is wiser in such a work to follow here his normal custom of leaving the disputed question at the point where the schools agree. There is a misprint of the Greek word on pp. 246 and 247, correctly spelt on p. 214.

Specially commendable are the three excellent indices, viz. of biblical passages, subjects and authors. There is no work I would more strongly recommend to readers of *SCRIPTURE*, as a ready companion to their studies and meditations.

H. FRANCIS DAVIS.

Saint Thomas d'Aquin, Somme Théologique: La Prophétie (2a-2ae: Questions 171-8). Traduction française par Paul Synave, O.P., et Pierre Benoit, O.P. (Desclée, Paris, 1947). pp. 398. 200 francs.

The young professor (and the usually still younger student) of Holy Scripture are likely to give a special welcome to this admirably clear and interesting treatment of those vital questions at the end of the *Secunda-Secundae* that concern prophecy, ecstasy, the gift of tongues, the power of working miracles, and, above all, under prophecy, the inspiration and inerrancy of the Divine Writings. The method of this series is well known—first, an accurate translation of the text of the *Summa*, with the Latin accompanying it at the foot of the page; next, a series of "notes explicatives" that form a continuous commentary of the articles most in need of elucidation; finally in the present volume, a compact mass of "renseignements techniques," extending to more than a hundred

closely-printed pages, and dealing, first, with the gift of prophecy according to St. Thomas's teaching, and then (pp. 293-76) with the inspiration of Holy Scripture—its existence, its nature (as contrasted with erroneous conceptions), the decisions of the ecclesiastical *magisterium*, the now somewhat unfashionable view of Cardinal Franzelin, and then the "principes d'une solution thomiste," embodying the substance of the brilliant articles contributed by Père M.-J. Lagrange, O.P., to the *Revue Biblique* for 1895 and 1896.

One of the most valuable features of the treatment is the chapter on the distinction between the speculative and the practical judgments, and on prophetic revelation, prophetic inspiration, and scriptural inspiration. The table at pp. 320-1 is one of the clearest imaginable. Here is an adaptation of it.

One may distinguish

(1) Prophetic REVELATION, which is a gift to the mind of supernatural knowledge by means of *species infusae*.

(2) Prophetic INSPIRATION, which is a light that illumines the *speculative* judgment, and elevates it to a supernatural mode of knowledge.

(3) *Scriptural* INSPIRATION: which is a supernatural impulse (i.e. *influxus supernaturalis*) that stimulates the will and directs the *practical* judgment with a view to the making of a book that should produce such and such an effect.

The possible ways of combining 1, 2 and 3 are as follows:

1 alone.

Examples: The Pharaoh or Balthasar when one of them received a revelation that he did not understand.

2 alone.

Examples: a prophet or an apostle passing judgment with the aid of supernatural enlightenment on information gained without the help of any special revelation.

3 alone.

Example: The inspired author of a scriptural book when he quotes on the authority of another, or writes of unessential matters *without committing himself to a formal affirmation* (this seems the best English equivalent of the French *sans engager son jugement de connaissance*).

1 and 2.

Example: A true prophet who passes judgment on a message received supernaturally.

1 and 3.

Example: An author who should write, at God's command, on the subject of revelations that he had received, but did not himself understand.

2 and 3.

Example : An inspired writer, when he passes a speculative judgment on his own inspired writings.

1, 2 and 3.

Example : A prophet (or inspired writer) who sets down in writing revelations that he has himself received, and *that he also understands*.

It would, surely, be difficult for any student, given ordinary good will, *not* to profit by a careful study of this table ? But this is only one of many excellent things among the "renseignements techniques." The discussion of the somewhat intricate topic of the extent of inspiration is wonderfully lucid and succinct, as is also the chapter on Biblical inerrancy, of which the opening sentence declares emphatically : "L'inerrance n'est pas le but de l'inspiration ; elle en est la conséquence. Ou mieux, elle est une de ses conséquences, parmi plusieurs autres" (p. 340). Three useful indexes complete a work that does the greatest credit to two eminent scholars of the Dominican Order, one of whom (Père Synave) did not live to see it finished.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

Scriptural References for the Baltimore Catechism: The Biblical Basis for Catholic Beliefs. By the Rev. G. H. Guyot, C.M., S.T.L., S.Scr.B. (Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York). 1947. pp. 155.

It is common for publishers' agents and blurb writers to describe some new book as "filling a long felt want," thus suggesting that it was written and produced not so much for personal or commercial reasons as in answer to insistent popular demand. It is very occasionally, however, that one comes across a book of which this can truly be said. Fr. Guyot's "Scriptural References" is such a book. The author himself seems to think so, too, for he has dispensed with the usual foreword, introduction and prefatory recommendation which we expect to find in a book of this kind. The text, he implies, will explain itself, and be its own recommendation. When we examine the text we find that it consists simply of the 499 Answers of the American Catechism, each Answer accompanied by two, three or four appropriate scriptural references, together with a few brief words of explanation or comment. We gather that it is intended as an aid-book for teachers of Christian doctrine. Would a teacher of Christian doctrine regard this Scriptural reference book as filling a long felt want in his teaching equipment ? There is hardly a teacher who would not reply immediately and emphatically in the affirmative.

Ever since the late Pope, in his Encyclical on Christian education, encouraged Christian teachers to use and exploit "all that is really good and useful in modern contributions to study and teaching methods," there has been a steadily growing movement to introduce and to popu-

larize certain of these methods in the particular field of religious instruction. In nearly every diocese in Great Britain at the present moment teachers in Catholic schools are being advised, exhorted, admonished, in season and out of season, to adopt the so-called "modern methods" in their teaching of religion. The new technique involves, among other things, a far greater use of Sacred Scripture than was hitherto the custom. It recommends the treatment of the Catechism as the children's reference-book, to be produced only as the conclusion of the religion lesson for the precise formularization of what has been taught and learned, and the substitution in place of the Catechism of the Scriptural story as the illustrative starting-point of the lesson.

The teachers on their part, have shown a commendable willingness, even an eagerness, to bring their classroom practice into line with the new theory. But with the best will in the world this has often proved difficult of accomplishment, owing to the insufficient acquaintance of the ordinary lay teacher with the Scriptural basis of dogma. A manual such as Fr. Guyot's, therefore, meets a very pressing need. The enthusiastic approval with which its appearance was hailed in Catholic educational circles in America, and the steady demand which even three editions of the work have not exhausted, is an index of its popularity with the teachers (it was first published in monthly instalments in the 1941-2 issues of the *Chicago Journal of Religious Instruction*, appeared in book form in 1944, was re-printed in 1947).

Catholic teachers in this country have long been envious of their American brethren's innumerable religious aid-books, guide-books, doctrinal text-books and catechetical manuals. "They certainly do these things well in America" is the comment one frequently hears. When it comes to books such as Fr. Guyot's which are such obvious boons to the hard-pressed teacher, the comment is more likely to be a plaintive "Why doesn't someone produce something like that over here?" Why, indeed? To a Scriptural scholar of even moderate ability it would be a relatively simple task to do for the English Catechism what Fr. Guyot has so admirably done for the American. And there is not a Catholic school in the country in which such a book would not receive instant and grateful acceptance.

K. CRONIN, C.M.

Praktisches Bibelhandbuch. Verlag Kath. Bibelwerk Stuttgart. 4th edition 1941. pp. 500.

This excellent manual is in many ways unique of its kind. Though compiled by a committee of Biblical experts its aim is not theoretical and abstract learning but to be of practical use to the clergy in their pastoral work and to such laity as are interested in Biblical matters. The bulk of the book consists of a Concordance of a very special sort. It omits

all words of only philological, geographical or antiquarian interest and limits itself to words and terms which are connected with devotional, religious or practical subjects. It contains some 30,000 items, set out with pleasing clearness. The long introduction of fifty pages contains a summary of each book of the Bible with a few notes of explanation and some hints on how to read the Bible with spiritual profit. The concordance is followed by a description of Palestine. Of special value is the first appendix on the use of texts in catechetical instruction and the second appendix gives guidance in the running of Bible classes. German Catholics are already accustomed to the idea of spending an "Hour with the Bible." To us in England, Bible classes or study-groups still seem to have a Protestant character about them. May it not long be so. The Bible is our treasure rather than theirs. The book ends with a splendid series of photographs.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

CHRIST'S HUMAN CHARACTER¹

Such, I take it, is the main purpose of this work : to set before us the Master's human character. It is what we might call in the case of any merely human being his true personality ; but our Lord's personality is divine, and therefore the term is best avoided in His case, as hardly consonant with a sound form of words. Ten different points or incidents are considered, and in each case the author has something vigorous and more or less original to say, so that the book seems well worth perusal ; and in each case some *Auswertungsmöglichkeiten* (German words are not becoming any shorter), which are practical applications. Such portmanteau words seem to make the author's style rather unnecessarily difficult, and though the work appears to be worth translating, the translator would need to be expert both in German and in the subject-matter. Perhaps the presentation of our Saviour makes him out in the general effect a little too masculine. The only passage (if I mistake not) in which He Himself directly describes (at least in part) His human character is where He declares that He is meek and humble of heart. For such a declaration the present work, excellent as it is in its general conception and execution, hardly does much to prepare us.

C. LATTEY, S.J.

¹ *Des Meisters Vorbild : Beiträge zum Jesusbild der Evangelien.* By Father Generous Marquardt, O.F.M. Verlag Kath. Bibel-werk, Stuttgart. 132 pp. Price not indicated. 1948.